



**OFFICE OF
THE ARIZONA ATTORNEY GENERAL**

JANET NAPOLITANO

Report on
RACIAL PROFILING

**Civil Rights Division
and
Office of Intergovernmental Affairs
January 2001**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II.	DEFINITION OF RACIAL PROFILING	2
III.	PREPARATORY ACTIVITIES	2
	A. Law Enforcement Surveys	2
	B. Private Resident Surveys	3
IV.	CONFERENCE SYNOPSIS	4
V.	BREAKOUT SESSION SUMMARY	4
	A. Definition of Racial Profiling	4
	B. Law Enforcement Concerns	4
	C. Private Resident Concerns	5
	D. Causes of Mistrust	5
	E. Solutions for Mistrust	5
	F. Statistical Evidence	6
VI.	RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL	6
	A. Policies and Procedures	6
	B. Training	8
	C. Diversity	8
	D. Technology	9
	E. Data Collection	9
	F. The Role of the Attorney General in Civil Rights Enforcement	10
	1. Model Policies and Procedures	10
	2. Survey Authority Pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1402(6)	10
	3. Individual Complaints of Discrimination	11
VII.	FOLLOW UP ACTIVITIES	11
VIII.	CONCLUSION	11
	APPENDIX	13

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.

The term “racial profiling” refers to the use by law enforcement personnel of an individual’s race or ethnicity as a factor in articulating reasonable suspicion to stop, question or arrest an individual (unless race or ethnicity is part of an identifying description of a specific suspect for a specific crime.) Individual law enforcement personnel who profile suspects on the basis of race or ethnicity violate the civil rights of those individuals. When race and ethnicity become factors in suspicious behavior, the civil rights of racial and ethnic minorities as a group are violated. This practice also leads to a negative interaction with the police. The State of Arizona and its political subdivisions cannot tolerate racial profiling if Arizona is to remain consistent and fair in its application of justice.

Arizona Attorney General Janet Napolitano, in her capacity as both the Chief Law Enforcement Officer and the Chief Civil Rights Enforcement Officer in Arizona, sponsored two Racial Profiling Conferences in an effort to define the problem and to seek recommendations for its eradication. A Racial Profiling Conference was held in Phoenix on May 23, 2000. A second Racial Profiling Conference was held in Tucson on November 9, 2000. Over 100 community members attended each Conference, with equal representation from officers with various law enforcement agencies and private residents involved in community-based organizations. As a result of the Conferences and a series of meetings with an ad hoc committee of law enforcement representatives, the Attorney General subsequently convened two summits of Arizona law enforcement (one in Phoenix and one in Tucson.) At each summit, representatives of police agencies publicly signed a Declaration Condemning Racial Profiling and promised an increased commitment to policies, procedures, training and community interaction to address the issue of racial profiling. (See Appendix.)

All members of the community-at-large, including law enforcement personnel and private residents, must reject racial profiling as a legitimate form of law enforcement. This requires commitment from all segments of society. Police agencies earn the respect of the community through impartial and consistent application of the laws. Private community members should, in return, recognize and respect the efforts of those who have elected to serve and protect the public. Finally, law enforcement personnel and private community residents need to engage in thorough communication. Police officers must explain their suspicions to all individuals whom they stop (unless an explanation restricts legitimate law enforcement activities), and private residents should exercise their rights to make both complaints and commendations at the appropriate time about law enforcement personnel.

This report is not a final resolution on the perception and impact of racial profiling in Arizona, but rather the beginning. Six factors may help law enforcement agencies and community advocates to continue to address this issue: 1) creation and implementation of law enforcement policies and procedures; 2) training for law enforcement and private residents; 3) diversity in hiring and promotional decisions, with an effort to retain diverse staff; 4) technology; 5) data collection; and 6) civil rights enforcement. The Attorney General’s Office urges continued cooperation and respect among law enforcement personnel and the communities whom they serve. The Attorney General further urges all law enforcement agencies in Arizona, including chiefs of police, county attorneys, county sheriffs and other peace officers, to develop policies and detailed implementation procedures to mitigate the perception and effects of racial profiling.

II. DEFINITION OF RACIAL PROFILING.

It is essential to first define racial profiling as a legal term of art in order to seek recommendations for its eradication. There are essentially two views among law enforcement agencies and civil rights organizations in defining prohibited conduct in stopping or arresting an individual: **any** reliance on race/ethnicity (the broad definition); or **sole** reliance on race/ethnicity (the narrow definition). The Ninth Circuit recently addressed this issue and adopted the broad definition. In *U.S. v. Montero-Camargo*, 208 F.3d 1122 (9th Cir. 2000), the court addressed the seizure of drugs from a vehicle near the U.S.-Mexico border in El Centro, California. Among the factors used by the Border Patrol to justify the stop of the vehicle was that the occupants of the vehicle were Hispanic. The Court upheld the seizure based on other factors (such as the fact that Defendants made a U-Turn in an area with no side roads and in plain view of the Border Patrol station) but declared that race could not be used even as one factor among many in a decision to stop a vehicle.

Reliance on race or ethnicity in criminal profiling treats minorities different from non minorities. Consistent with *Montero-Camargo* **any** reliance on race and/or ethnicity in articulating reasonable suspicion is prohibited and may expose a police agency to liability for civil rights violations. *Montero-Camargo* and other Ninth Circuit cases recognize a limited exception for investigations in which race or ethnicity is part of an identifying description of a specific suspect for a specific crime.

III. PREPARATORY ACTIVITIES.

The Attorney General's Office invited representatives to the Conferences from two groups who together make up the community-at-large: law enforcement personnel and private residents. Participants included representatives from a variety of municipalities – large and small; urban and rural; those with a high percentage of minority residents and those with a lower percentage of minority residents. This Office also surveyed each representative in order to help it assess concerns and beliefs of the participants prior to each Conference.

A. Law Enforcement Surveys.

The law enforcement surveys sought information regarding training of officers, demographics of the community, and statistical data for both stops and arrests. Seventeen law enforcement agencies, from Cochise, Graham, Maricopa, Pima, Pinal and Yuma Counties, responded to the survey. None of the respondents believed that racial or ethnic background alone could justify a police stop – implicit in some responses, however, was the proposition that race and/or ethnicity can be one factor among many in a decision to stop. Comments included the following:

“This means that profiling based **solely** on race, ethnic origin and/or language is prohibited in this Department” (emphasis added).

“[Race or ethnicity] is only taken into consideration with a total set of circumstances.”

“[Race or ethnicity may be considered] if there is substantiated information that a particular crime is being committed by one racial/ethnic group.”

As discussed above, *Montero-Camargo* recognizes a broader definition of racial profiling. Law enforcement agencies need to prohibit any reliance on race and/or ethnicity in articulating reasonable suspicion for stopping individual members of the community (with a limited exception in a case in which race or ethnicity is a part of the description of a specific suspect for a specific crime.)

B. Private Resident Surveys.

The private resident surveys sought examples of racial profiling as well as general perceptions of whether or not racial profiling exists. Sixty-six percent of the respondents gave specific examples of racial profiling by law enforcement. Many of the responses focused on direct comparisons with White youth:

“...[L]aw enforcement makes the assumption that Black and Hispanic youth are gang members. They are questioned in a different manner than White youth, charged differently for the same offense, and are sentenced differently for crimes committed.”

“... [W]hile white, affluent youth often have beer parties out in the desert, you never see their names in the paper for illegal consumption. What you do see are the names of Native Americans from the three adjacent reservations, listed in the paper, arrested for illegal consumption.”

Other responses focused on the lack of communication and understanding between law enforcement members of the community and private residents:

“I think that a lot of white policemen have not grown up around blacks and therefore do not have an understanding about them, and only rely on rumors and hearsay about them.”

“[I]f language is involved, i.e., the suspect does not speak English fluently enough to explain their version of the incident, the likelihood that the non-English speaker will be cited or arrested increases tremendously.”

IV. CONFERENCE SYNOPSIS.

Each Conference focused on community discussion. Participants were divided into six breakout groups for facilitated discussion led by Attorney General staff. The breakout groups discussed the issues surrounding racial profiling in their morning session and proposed suggestions in the afternoon.

The breakout sessions were interspersed with more formal presentations to the assembled participants. At the Phoenix Conference two members of law enforcement spoke: Gil Gallegos, President of the Fraternal Order of Police, and Phoenix Police Chief Harold Hurtt. Two private members of the community also spoke: Luis Ibarra, Executive Director of Friendly House, and civil rights attorney John Burris. At the Tucson Conference, Tucson Police Chief Richard Miranda gave a presentation and Tucson Police Captain John Leavitt presented an analysis of his Department’s data collection efforts to date. Private community member Amanda Phillips of St. Mark’s Presbyterian Church discussed the ongoing community-police dialogue in Tucson.

V. BREAKOUT SESSION SUMMARY.

Each of the six breakout groups was composed of a similar number of law enforcement officers and private community members. All groups should be commended for their frank discussions and respectful exchange of views. Representatives designated by each breakout group gave short presentations and recommendations at the end to the full assembly. The following comments summarize the major observations and suggestions made by breakout groups at the two Conferences.

A. Definition of Racial Profiling.

Some groups wrestled with a definition of racial profiling. No clear consensus emerged between the narrow definition (sole reliance on race/ethnicity) and the broad definition (any reliance on race/ethnicity). All groups recognized that racial profiling of suspects does occur within law enforcement. Of equal importance, no group suggested that entire Departments profile by race or ethnicity. The groups also recognized that racial profiling occurs as a result of biases and prejudices of individual law enforcement personnel, in addition to the biases of their trainers.

B. Law Enforcement Concerns.

The law enforcement members of the community first and foremost raised concerns about the effect of not stopping individuals who exhibit suspicious behavior. Some officers feared that heightened concerns about racial profiling could dissuade law enforcement personnel from stopping crimes in progress.

Department and agency representatives also raised concerns about the effect of heightened concerns on the officers themselves. Some officers fear retaliation for reporting others who profile based on race; others fear that data collected in stops could be misused to punish law enforcement personnel. Finally, union and association representatives raised concerns about discipline, and strongly suggested that personnel actions against officers based on allegations of racial profiling should include progressive discipline beginning with training and/or counseling.

C. Private Resident Concerns.

Many private community members perceive that minorities are victims of discrimination by law enforcement, either because they are stopped without a reason or because non minorities would not be stopped for similar violations. The minority members of the private community noted their frustration at having to tell their children how to behave in a police stop in order to mitigate the potential for violence. Private residents also expressed frustration with police stereotypes of individuals from different cultures. Private resident concerns essentially come down to one word: trust.

D. Causes of Mistrust.

Participants raised lack of communication most frequently as a cause of mistrust between law enforcement and private residents. Perception exists among private community members that law enforcement personnel do not adequately explain their reasons for stopping an individual. Private

community members also expressed frustration that many law enforcement personnel were not familiar with the individual communities and cultures which they serve, or do not speak the common language spoken within the community. On the other hand, law enforcement community members perceive themselves to be held, by private community members and the media, to an unfair standard, in that racial profiling exists in other professions as well. Most participants recognized, however, that the power that law enforcement personnel hold subjects them to higher standards.

Participants also raised concerns about private community members who profile their neighbors. “Profiling by proxy” may occur when majority members of a neighborhood make complaints to the police about individuals in the neighborhood based in part on the language spoken or the racial and ethnic background of a neighbor or passerby. Private community members have an obligation to avoid stereotyping people of different cultures and backgrounds when they report suspicious activity to the police.

E. Solutions for Mistrust.

Participants raised numerous suggestions to deal with the divide that at times appears to exist between law enforcement and private residents of a community. Many participants stressed the importance of a well-publicized complaint process which details expectations of both parties (the person stopped and the law enforcement officer), in addition to remedies available to the person stopped. (Some jurisdictions, including the City of Phoenix, have already developed “What to Do When Stopped by the Police” brochures in English and Spanish.) Given the fact that the Internet has become more accessible, several participants also suggested a web-based alternative to the written or telephonic complaint process.

Participants also raised other suggestions to deal with mistrust, including the use of mediators, development of “citizen police academies,” construction of additional neighborhood police substations, and the use of questionnaires seeking positive and negative feedback on officer conduct from random individuals who have come into contact with law enforcement. Finally, some participants noted the objectivity which an independent police auditor can bring to the debate over racial profiling.

F. Statistical Evidence.

Many groups discussed the use of statistical evidence to determine whether or not members of minority racial and ethnic groups are stopped or arrested in greater proportion than their representation in a particular community or on its roads. The information necessary to such an assessment is not always maintained by law enforcement agencies, especially information on “dispositionless stops” – those stops in which the law enforcement officer neither wrote a ticket nor took any official action against the individual. Participants noticed that Departments within Arizona differ greatly in the information maintained on stops, and on the methods, if any, to analyze the data in terms of racial and ethnic demographics.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Racial profiling may have implications well beyond the initial decision to stop -- racial and ethnic minorities are overrepresented in the criminal justice system, and we need to begin at the stage of initial contact in order to analyze the reasons for this disparity. To the extent that individual law enforcement personnel target members of particular racial and ethnic groups through profiling, their conduct exacerbates

the statistical disparity. The community-at-large, however, can help to prevent targeting and profiling and ensure that law enforcement acts only on reasonable suspicion. The Attorney General makes the following recommendations to address these issues:

A. Policies and Procedures.

Many law enforcement agencies already have policies in place prohibiting racial profiling. However, Departments must also have operating procedures which implement the policy and give guidance to individual law enforcement personnel. Departments should also review existing disciplinary policies to include appropriate action for law enforcement personnel who engage in racial profiling. The Office of the Attorney General will continue to work with organizations such as the Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police to develop model policies for use by law enforcement agencies. Topics addressed in procedures should include the following:

- a definition of reasonable suspicion, in order to ensure that individuals are stopped for valid reasons, and that racial and ethnic minorities are not stopped for violations for which non minority drivers would not be stopped;
- a requirement that officers articulate reasonable suspicion prior to a stop, frisk, arrest or detention;
- a systematic review process for investigating allegations of racial profiling;
- an assurance that supervisors will support and not retaliate against officers who report racial profiling by others;
- creation, maintenance and disposition of documents evidencing a traffic stop; and
- standards for the use of in-car audio and visual equipment, including the duration for which the tapes are preserved.

Even if a stop is justified, the conduct of law enforcement personnel during the stop must remain reasonable. Law enforcement personnel should remain aware of and never seek to exploit the power they have over the public. Officers should:

- identify themselves by full name and jurisdiction, and, where financially feasible, proffer written identification, such as a business card;
- explain the reason for the stop;
- show respect toward the suspect; and
- conclude the stop in an expeditious manner.

Law enforcement agencies should also adopt policies and procedures for communication with the public to ensure that police agencies:

- publicize their policies and procedures to the community-at-large and encourage the filing of complaints or concerns;
- disseminate, in a frank and straightforward manner, the results of timely internal investigations into racial profiling;
- provide a written response, after an investigation of the facts, to residents who make complaints of racial profiling; and
- introduce and publicize communications systems which permit anonymous complaints or commendations about law enforcement personnel by members of the public – some communities already have hotlines which provide this opportunity.

B. Training.

Law enforcement agencies need to emphasize the prohibition on racial and ethnic profiling to recruits as well as seasoned officers.

- Departments should ensure that their operating procedures adequately implement the prohibition against profiling and that their law enforcement personnel have copies of, understand and follow the procedures.
- Training, including scenario-based sessions, should be comprehensive and begin in the academy and continue with regular education and certification.
- Training should include cultural differences – not all actions by a suspect are a sign of disrespect.
- Training should include foreign language instruction where appropriate, in order to ensure communication with residents of a community.
- Racial profiling discussions should be incorporated into existing school education programs such as D.A.R.E.
- Supervisors and community officers should actively participate in and undergo this training to ensure that they react appropriately to impermissible behavior during field evaluations or other reviews.
- After a field supervisor or other reviewer has detected a pattern, Departments should provide assistance for individual officers who have been accused of, or appear to be, profiling by race, to ensure that they take steps to remediate their conduct.

C. Diversity.

Local and statewide law enforcement agencies should reflect the community-at-large. Officers who know the community and are familiar with different cultures can assist their Departments to avoid the biases and mistrust that are at the heart of racial profiling.

- Recruitment -- To the extent that minority groups have been historically underrepresented within a law enforcement agency, that agency should take aggressive steps to ensure that the law enforcement personnel reflect the demographics of the communities they have sworn to protect and that members of all racial and ethnic groups have equal promotional opportunities.
- Fair and Effective Supervision – In order to retain minority recruits, supervisors must ensure that the working environment is free of racial and ethnic hostility.
- Rotation of Officers -- Line officers should rotate through the community to better understand residents of different neighborhoods.

D. Technology.

Individual Departments need to assess the extent to which racial profiling occurs by their officers. Law enforcement agencies, as financially feasible, should utilize new forms of technology in addressing the perceptions and problems of racial profiling.

- In-car audio and visual equipment which begin recording when the lights and siren are started will provide an objective record of police and suspect conduct. Departments should preserve this record during the limitations period for civil rights lawsuits. Some law enforcement agencies in Arizona, including the Department of Public Safety and the Tucson Police Department, have begun to use this technology effectively. The Attorney General would support increased appropriations for law enforcement to improve access to this technology.
- Mobile data terminals in police cars will lighten dramatically any burden of collecting and maintaining statistics on police stops.
- Internet web pages can publicize the policies and procedures against racial profiling, and the action taken to address the problem and/or perception, to the community-at-large.
- Private community members should support their Department's acquisition of new technology in order to ensure that the community-at-large addresses the prohibition on racial and ethnic profiling.

E. Data Collection.

Each jurisdiction should decide for itself whether to engage in data collection and assessment of the racial and ethnic demographics of the individuals stopped. A number of jurisdictions throughout the country require law enforcement personnel to record, for every vehicle stop, information including the following:

- the race and ethnicity of the individual(s) stopped;
- the gender of the individual(s) stopped;
- the age of the individual(s) stopped;
- the location of the stop;
- the reason for the stop; and
- the disposition (none, warning, citation, arrest, etc.) of the stop.

Some law enforcement personnel have expressed dissatisfaction with even voluntary data collection, both because it may expose agencies to liability and because it may dissuade officers from stopping people for suspicious behavior before a crime results. Some believe, however, that data collection can provide benefits to a Department through self-audits and early warning systems which identify racial profiling behavior, and by deterring inappropriate law enforcement conduct. Because there are reasonable disagreements on whether to collect data, and numerous models for data collection from which to choose, this Office takes no position on data collection at this time. This Office instead urges each agency to evaluate for itself whether to collect racial and ethnic data on stops, and, if so, how to collect, maintain and analyze the data.

F. The Role of the Attorney General in Civil Rights Enforcement.

The Attorney General's Office sponsored the Conferences in order to begin a dialogue with the community-at-large and will continue to address issues surrounding racial profiling.

1. Model Policies and Procedures.

This Office has already begun to work with law enforcement agencies in the development of policies and procedures to address racial profiling concerns. Representatives of this Office, together with an ad hoc committee composed of law enforcement officers from various organizations, developed a Declaration Condemning Racial Profiling. Law enforcement officers throughout the State are united in the fight against racial profiling and signed the Declaration on December 19, 2000. (See Appendix.) The Declaration pledges that individual Departments will develop policies and procedures against racial profiling by June 2001. The Attorney General's Office will continue to work with the ad hoc committee in the development of model policies and procedures for use by individual Departments.

2. Survey Authority Pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1402(6).

Arizona law permits the Attorney General to “make periodic surveys of the existence and effect of discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap or national origin in the enjoyment of civil rights by any person” To the extent that a political subdivision seeks to become a model for implementing procedures to eliminate racial profiling, this Office can review the municipalities’ stops and arrests, make observations about any profiling which has occurred or is occurring, and issue recommendations to assist the community in eradicating the evils of profiling based on race and/or ethnicity.

3. Individual Complaints of Discrimination.

Any individual who believes that he or she is a victim of racial profiling should contact the Civil Rights Division of the Arizona Attorney General’s Office at (602) 542-5263 or (877) 491-5742 (toll-free) or (877) 624-8090 (toll-free TTY). Based on the particular facts, an individual may be able to file a charge of discrimination against a local police agency under the Arizona Civil Rights Act. If the facts of a particular case do not merit jurisdiction over a charge of discrimination under the Arizona Civil Rights Act, this Office will assist in referring the complaint to the appropriate federal or state agency with jurisdiction to investigate, such as the Office for Civil Rights (Office of Justice Programs) at the U.S. Department of Justice. Individuals should also consider a written complaint to the law enforcement agency which made the disputed stop.

VII. FOLLOW UP ACTIVITIES.

The Attorney General’s Office will continue to work with law enforcement representatives to develop model policies and procedures, and will review the models developed. The Office also will solicit input from private residents to determine the effectiveness of policy changes. The Attorney General anticipates the following time frame:

February 2001	Formation of working group.
May 15, 2001	Attorney General review of model policies and procedures, and distribution to Arizona law enforcement agencies.
June 30, 2001	Deadline for Arizona law enforcement agencies to promulgate policies and procedures prohibiting racial profiling.
November 2001	Preparation of community survey, and distribution to all participants at the two Conferences.
January 2002	Subsequent Attorney General report as to the effect of the implemented policies and procedures.

VIII. CONCLUSION.

Racial profiling should not and must not be tolerated within law enforcement agencies. When individuals profile by race, it has a twofold effect: 1) the agency (and the State) may lose the ability to use certain evidence in court proceedings; and 2) the community may lose respect for law enforcement. All Arizonans benefit from investigative techniques and policies which are universally applied and consistently followed from suspect to suspect and from community to community.

Consistent with case law, law enforcement personnel must make stops based on reasonable suspicion, without the use of race or ethnicity as a factor in the decision. Departments should also develop policies and procedures and communicate them to all officers through continued training and education. Finally, law enforcement agencies should develop and maintain processes for resident complaints. Community members should make complaints and commendations in regard to their interaction with law enforcement and follow up accordingly.

APPENDIX

DECLARATION OF ARIZONA LAW ENFORCEMENT CONDEMNING RACIAL PROFILING

WHEREAS, neither race nor ethnicity is a predictor for criminal behavior; and

WHEREAS, national attention has been directed recently to law enforcement stops made on the basis of race or ethnicity; and

WHEREAS, some state and national advocacy groups perceive that racial profiling is a widespread practice among law enforcement personnel; and

WHEREAS, Arizona law enforcement personnel, including chiefs of police, county sheriffs, county attorneys and other peace officers, seek to maintain the trust of the local communities which we serve through community policing and by enforcing laws in a non-discriminatory manner; and

WHEREAS, the International Association of Chiefs of Police has resolved that biased or unprofessional enforcement practices are prohibited and will not be condoned; and

WHEREAS, the Arizona Attorney General, as the chief law enforcement officer of the State, condemns racial profiling and urges Arizona law enforcement agencies to adopt policies and procedures prohibiting racial and ethnic profiling;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY

RESOLVED that Arizona law enforcement personnel will not participate in the use of any racial or ethnic-based profile in stopping, frisking, searching or detaining individuals or vehicles; and it is

RESOLVED that all Arizona law enforcement agencies currently have, or will develop, a policy defining and prohibiting racial profiling; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED that each Arizona law enforcement agency has or will develop procedures implementing its policy, and that the procedures will be in writing, communicated to all law enforcement personnel and made available to local residents through public outreach; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED that, in developing these procedures, law enforcement agencies will examine all aspects of their enforcement, in terms of the definition of racial profiling and reasonable suspicion, the conduct of officers during a stop, the mission and value statements of the organization, field supervision, officer evaluations, community involvement, the evaluation of resident complaints and the communication of the outcome to the complainant, internal audits, and other efforts to ensure that its officers do not engage in racial profiling and do treat residents with the utmost courtesy and respect; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED that law enforcement agencies will incorporate training on prohibited profiling practices into academy classes as well as in continued education throughout the career of each officer; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED that Arizona law enforcement agencies make it a priority to adopt these policies and procedures prohibiting racial profiling by June, 2001.

DATED this 19th day of December, 2000.

DECLARATION OF ARIZONA LAW ENFORCEMENT CONDEMNING RACIAL PROFILING

/s/

Janet Napolitano
Arizona Attorney General

/s/

Richard Anemone, President
Tucson Police Officers Association

/s/

Charles Foy, President
Arizona Conference of Police and Sheriffs

/s/

Steve Gendler, Director
Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police

/s/

Danny Lugo, President
Latino Peace Officers Association,
Tucson Chapter

/s/

Bill Washington
National Organization of Black Law
Enforcement Executives, Arizona Chapter

/s/

Richard Miranda, Chief
Tucson Police Department

DECLARATION OF ARIZONA LAW ENFORCEMENT

CONDEMNING RACIAL PROFILING

/s/

Janet Napolitano
Arizona Attorney General

/s/

Frank Balkcom, President
Latino Peace Officers Association

/s/

Levi Bolton, Vice President
Phoenix Law Enforcement Association

/s/

Chris Crockett, President
National Organization of Black Law
Enforcement Executives, Arizona Chapter

/s/

Charles Foy, President
Arizona Conference of Police and Sheriffs

/s/

Steve Gendler, Director
Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police

/s/

Ralph Ogden, Sheriff
Arizona Sheriffs Association

/s/

Tom Powers, President
Associated Highway Patrolmen of
Arizona

/s/

Lee Rappleyea, President
Fraternal Order of Police

/s/

Tom Sheahan, Sheriff
Arizona County Attorneys and
Sheriffs Association